

Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)

Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Wynn

Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—180

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse

Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecza
Klink
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal

Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Yates

NOT VOTING—7

Collins (IL)
Johnston
Moakley

Radanovich
Stark
Stokes

Waters

□ 1406

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR ALL COMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY AND THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARMEY moves pursuant to clause 2(i) of rule XI that for today and the balance of the

week all committees be granted special leave to sit while the House is reading a measure for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have a good deal of important business ahead of us, both on the floor and in the committees, during this week and the next. It is, of course, out of consideration for the Members on the floor and in the committees relative to their pending district work period that I make this request. I want to appreciate for a moment the Members of the body on both sides of the aisle for their cooperation with me with respect to this request.

Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I first wish to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has now just arrived, and I was waiting until he got here.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri not only for yielding but for that introduction.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I will be frank about it. I really have nothing to say about this. We are going to let the gentleman from California speak for a few minutes and tell the Members about what happened.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, would my friend from Missouri yield for a second?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman all the time I have.

Mr. FAZIO of California. That is what I wanted to know, how much time he was yielding to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] yields 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

There was no objection.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, we had an interesting session this morning, however brief it may have been. Interesting in the sense that it, I think, is perhaps too typical of the kind of hearings that we are seeing here in the House of Representatives. Unfortunately in that it did not include a balanced presentation on a very important issue to Members of this House.

In fact, I think to the country at large, and that is how we deal with the question of voter education, how we deal with the issue of expenditures that are made outside the Federal election process. We had invited almost 25 groups from all across the spectrum, from Common Cause and the Sierra Club to the Christian Coalition and

Citizens for a Sound Economy. Yet, when it came time to hold the hearing, the only people who were brought to the witness table, theoretically, they chose not to come. In my view that was the right decision, those people representing working men and women, organized labor.

Mr. Speaker, now, it is easy to demonize our foes in this area, and both parties certainly have a preponderance of friends from one side of the spectrum to the other which they often like to demonize. But if we are going to hold hearings that really get to the root cause of how we can reform our political system, we cannot play favorites. We cannot just hold up those people representing the interest of working people because they have priorities and they have concerns that do not know in the direction the majority wants to go in.

We have seen too much of this when the AARP was brought up before a Senate committee because they were standing up for Social Security, or critical of some of the Medicare reform proposals. I just simply wanted my colleagues to know, and I think I speak for every member of our committee, that this behavior of the Committee on House Oversight today is going to inflame passions here, is going to create an impossible environment for us to work this most important issue of campaign finance reform in.

There are many, many groups spending hundreds of millions of dollars without limitation, without any attribution to any individual, no disclosure at all, who are working hand in glove with the majority in this House to affect its agenda. We were not willing or able to hear any of the testimony that might have enlightened us about that. It was only to go after people who in the minds of, I guess, the majority of that committee, were associated with the Democratic Caucus. I feel very much compelled to object to that process.

Every member of our committee absented ourselves from the hearing today because we felt it was an inquisition. It was a kangaroo court designed to embarrass people who are merely spending, legally, their dues to put across a point of view to help educate their members and hopefully to impact on the Members in this body before they make a number of mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply close by saying this side of the aisle is prepared to work on these issues as long as we come to the table in a bipartisan manner. I am told in the aftermath of our decision to leave that we were told the room was not big enough, the table was not large enough to bring all the various interests together to discuss this. We only had to select one. Well, I think that is a metaphor that concerns me. The table ought to be big enough for all of the interest groups and all the points of view in this country to be heard.

When we single out people, then we make enemies of people. Then I think

we are doing a lot of damage to this process. As long as the working people of this country want to be heard in this institution legally through their organizations that they pay dues to, we ought to listen to them and we ought to accommodate them. We ought not to single them out and take vengeance on them simply because they have another point of view that is unpopular with the majority.

□ 1415

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding me this time, and I want to thank my colleague from California for once again letting the chairman know of his interest in making sure that there is no hearing in which labor unions have to present any testimony about anything at all. Today's hearing was, in fact, the fourth hearing in a series of hearings, which are the most extensive in the history of this Congress on the campaign finance bills that were passed in the 1970's.

Our hearings started off in a bipartisan way. We had the Speaker of the House and the minority leader of the House talk about their vision of where they wanted to go. We also had all of the Members who have introduced legislation who want to see change in campaign finance laws. In fact, there were so many Members, we had to carry some over to the second hearing.

In the second hearing we heard from corporations, we heard from people who believe constitutionally they have a right to form political action committees, we heard from labor unions about the narrow segment of union political activity under the Federal Election Commission.

In our third hearing we had national chairmen of both the Democratic and Republican Parties talking about how the law unnecessarily hamstring political parties, in their opinion, vis-à-vis labor unions and other groups who are able to participate in the process far beyond political parties, and on a bipartisan basis those leaders urged us to look at changing the law affecting political parties.

This is the fourth hearing in our series of hearings. It seemed entirely appropriate since less than 1 week from now labor unions are meeting here in Washington to discuss increasing their dues to put more than \$35 million into the political arena, which they have, and I will not yield at this time because I would like to finish my statement, in which the workers who are paying for this have no knowledge under the law, either under the FEC, or the Labor Department, or the NLRB, National Labor Relations Board, as to where and how much money is spent in the political process. The people who participate in elections, the voters, do not under the law have any under-

standing, or idea, of how much money because it simply is not required under current law to be reported. We invited the president of the AFL-CIO, the president of the Teamsters, and the secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO to provide us with some understanding of this involvement in the political process. We fully intend to go forward with additional hearings to hear from other groups.

What was the response of the minority to yet one more hearing to get a full, complete understanding of participation in this process? Either within or outside the law? Either through sheer arrogance or fear the union leaders decided they would not show up and the Democrats would not participate in the hearing.

Who did we have testifying that made it so slanted, so misrepresentative? We had two individuals from the Congressional Research Service, individuals who are pledged in their testimony to be fair and bipartisan; in fact, so much so that every opening statement of a witness from the Congressional Research Service has to state as much. We had professors of economics and labor to help us to understand that under the law, in an incomparable way, labor unions can participate in the political process without any, without any, requirement to disclose to the public when and how that money is spent, but, even more fundamentally, to the people who contribute the money themselves. That information is so shocking, so important to the Democrats, that they have to walk out of a committee and refuse to have people come to the committee so that the American people can understand when and how labor unions influence elections.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the two gentlemen from California for that scintillating debate, and, if I might, I would like to thank the gentleman from Missouri for having made it possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 384 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2202.

□ 1420

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2202) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing Border Patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and deportation law and procedures, by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes with Mr. BONILLA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 20, 1996, amendment No. 18 printed in part 2 of House Report 104-483, offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] had been disposed of.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in part 2 of House Report 104-483, as modified by the order of the House of March 19, 1996.

AMENDMENT, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. CHRYSLER

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, as modified, made in order by the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment, as modified.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. CHRYSLER: Strike from title V all except section 522 and subtitle D.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], and I ask unanimous consent that he be able to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me first start out by addressing some unfortunate distortions concerning our amendment. Our amendment does not increase immigration levels, and it does not touch the welfare restrictions in the bill. It does keep families together. Our amendment will simply restore the legal immigration categories that are defined under current law, strike the cuts in permanent employer-sponsored immigration, and keep refugees' admission at the current annual limit.

It is simply wrong that this immigration reform bill prohibits adult children, brothers, sisters, and parents from immigrating to the United States. That is right. Under this bill,